

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:	) Group Art Unit: 2185
	)
MORROW, Michael	)
	) Examiner: KIM, Hong Chong
Application No.: 10/788,725	)
	) Notice of Allowance Dated: May 1, 2007
Filed: February 26, 2004	)
	)
For: LOW POWER SEMI-TRACE	) Confirmation No.: 6814
INSTRUCTION CACHE	)

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear the Examiner's reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104(e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. In fact, the Examiner agrees, stating in the Notice of Allowability dated May 1, 2007, p. 4, that "the reasons for allowance of the claims over the prior art of record is believed to be clear from the prosecution records taken as a whole."

Although the Examiner appears to agree with the Applicant that the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance, the Examiner provided Reasons for Allowance in which the Examiner states that all of claims 1-26 are allowable over the

prior art of record “because none of the prior art of record teaches or fairly suggest a device, a system, method comprises a cache array having cache lines filled with contiguous instructions in an instruction cache (ICache) portion that is adjacent to a trace cache (TCache) portion wherein cache lines are filled with elements of a trace; and neither the ICache portion nor the TCache portion are looked-up when the TCache portion is supplying instructions; and an instruction indexing logic, wherein the indexing logic is not used for either the ICache portion or TCache portion when the TCache portion is supplying instructions; and the TCache portion is indexed only when a processor executes one of: a branch instruction; a jump instruction; a call instruction; and a return instruction.” The Examiner’s Reasons for Allowance quotes the language of allowed claim 1 as the purported reasons for allowance of all of claims 1-26; however, each of claims 2-26 contains language that does not exactly correspond to the language quoted from claim 1. Applicants wish the record to reflect that, for this reason, Applicant does not necessary agree with the stated reasons for allowance as to claims 2-26.

Applicant’s claims should be limited only by the terms utilized therein. Thus, Applicant hereby submits these Comments in an effort to ensure that the claims are properly construed based only upon limitations that are actually present therein and/or to ensure that the claims are not interpreted so as to include any additional claim limitations that are not found in the respective claims.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. If

necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0916 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Date: July 31, 2007

By:   
Linda J. Thayer  
Reg. No. 45,681